



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,763	12/21/2001	L. Jeffrey Kapner III	K35A0882	3826

35219 7590 01/24/2007  
WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
ATTN: SANDRA GENUA  
20511 LAKE FOREST DR.  
E-118G  
LAKE FOREST, CA 92630

EXAMINER
----------

O STEEN, DAVID R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/035,763	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAPNER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> David R. O'Steen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed October 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On pages 9 and 10 of the Remarks section, the applicant states that neither Schlarb nor Haddad teach or suggest a program receiver determining a potential transmission time of a pay per view program to be received at the program receiver based on the plurality of transmission times. Instead, the applicant maintains that transmission times are solely dealt with at the "Distribution Center." The examiner disagrees. While the examiner does note that Haddad discloses, in his invention, a variety of methods to make the transmission of programming to the end users as efficient as possible (for more detail, please see Haddad, columns 9, 10, and 11), it is still primarily provides a schedule to the personal recording device to let it know when it can record. In this respect, it acts much like any normal program guide. All automatic recording devices, including the applicant's (see the applicant's own disclosure, page 7, lines 23-39) rely on the schedule obtained from the "distribution center" also commonly known as the head-end to record the programs. Haddad, in numerous places, shows that the recording system plays a role in determining and receiving the program during a transmission time. For example, in column 6, lines 38-62, when discussing the subscriber terminal, Haddad teaches that it is able request and receive authorization for program segment downloads. This insures that the recording device records the proper download at the proper time. This same functionality is alluded to when discussing the

Art Unit: 2623

Subscriber Terminal Software (col. 14, lines 9-13). This functionality mirrors what the applicant discloses in the specification (see columns 7 and 8, lines 23-31 and 1-10).

The fact that Haddad discloses additional technology which make the overall system more efficient in no way obscures this basic fact. The applicant makes a similar argument with regard to claims 11 and 18, and the examiner's response is similar.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlarb (US 2004/0078823) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982).

As regards Claim 1, Schlarb discloses a method of selecting a pay per view program to be transmitted to a program receiver, the method comprising: a) obtaining a schedule of pay per view programs each programs having a title and a plurality of transmission times (fig. 3.302); b) generating a menu (such as an EPG) comprising the titles of at least one pay per view program, based on the schedule (figure 3); c) providing the menu to a display device for display to the user (paragraph 17, lines 6-9); and d) receiving from the user a selection by title of the pay per view program from the

Art Unit: 2623

menu to be received by the program receiver (paragraph 20, lines 6-7). Schlarb fails to disclose e) determining a potential transmission time of the pay per view program to be received by the program receiver based on the plurality of transmission time in the schedule of pay per view programs. Haddad discloses determining a potential transmission time of the program to be received by the program receiver based on the at least one transmission time in the schedule of programs (col. 14, 8-13).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the scheduling system of Haddad, an analogous art, to the PPV system of Schlarb to allow the viewer more flexibility in watching PPV events.

As regards Claim 10, Schlarb further discloses that (d) further comprises receiving a payment authorization from the user (paragraph 23, lines 11-18).

Claims 2, 5, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlarb (US 2004/0078823) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) and in further view of LaJoie (US 5,850,218).

As regards Claim 2, Schlarb and Haddad jointly discloses the method of Claim 1 and Haddad further discloses f) determining if an availability status of a content delivery path is available at a predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time; g) if the availability status of the content delivery path is available at the predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time, requesting transmission of the pay per view program at the potential transmission time on the associated transmission channel; (col. 10, lines 5-12) and h) if the availability status of the content delivery path is not

Art Unit: 2623

available at the predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time, repeating (e) – (g) until the availability status of the content delivery path is available (col. 10, lines 12-25).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the conflict and scheduling of Haddad with the PPV recording system of Schlarb to insure that a scheduled program could be recorded at the proper time.

Schlarb and Haddad do not disclose that the determining is done at the program receiver. LaJoie does disclose that the determining is done at the program receiver (Fig. 12 and cols. 21 and 22, lines 30-67 and 1-5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to perform the conflict and scheduling at the receiver, as done in LaJoie, an analogous art, PPV recording system of Schlarb and Haddad to ensure that the receiver was ready without relying on the head-end.

As regards Claim 5, Haddad further discloses receiving the pay per view program at the potential transmission time (col. 12, lines 4-17).

As regards Claim 7, Haddad further discloses j) storing the pay per view program; and k) making the pay per view program available for viewing (col. 3, lines 23-31).

As regards Claim 8, Haddad further discloses wherein the pay per view program is stored on a hard disk drive (cols. 6 and 7, lines 67 and 1-7).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the hard disk drive of Haddad with PPV recording system of Schlarb because

Art Unit: 2623

hard disk drives are a reliable and increasingly inexpensive way of storing video content.

As regards Claim 9, Haddad further discloses that (k) further comprises displaying a notification that the pay per view program is available for display (col. 9, lines 28-32).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the notification of Haddad with PPV recording system of Schlarb and Mendelsohn so that the user knows when the program is available.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlarb (US 2004/0078823) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) and in further view of LaJoie (US 5,850,218) and in further view of Ellis (US 2005/0235323).

As regards Claim 3, Scharb, Haddad, and LaJoie jointly disclose the method of Claim 2. Haddad further discloses i) determining if a program is scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time (col. 10, lines 8-12); ii) if a program is scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time (i.e. other program segments on order), determining that the availability status of the content delivery path is not available (col. 10, lines 8-12); and iii) if no programs are scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time, at the predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time (col. 11, lines 6-10). Schlarb, Haddad, and LaJoie do not disclose (1) displaying a change channel request to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time; (2) waiting a predetermined

Art Unit: 2623

wait for response time for a response to the change channel request from the user; (3) if the response from the changed channel request received from the user is positive, determining that the availability status of the content delivery path is available; (4) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is negative; determining that the availability status of the content delivery path is not available; and (5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, determining that the availability status of the content path is available. Ellis discloses (1) displaying a change channel request (presented as a viewer option in fig. 4b) to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time; (2) waiting a predetermined wait for response time for a response to the change channel request from the user; and (5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, determining that the availability status of the content path is available (recording process involves changing to the appropriate channel, fig. 3b between blocks 312 and 314, and figs. 3b and 4a and paragraph 52). If the receiver is not tuned to the correct channel (the channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast), then the recorder is unable to record the scheduled program and the availability status of the content delivery path (channel) is not available. Likewise, if the receiver is tuned to the appropriate channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast, then it is true that the status of the content delivery path is available.



At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the reminder system of Ellis, an analogous art, to the PPV system of Schlarb, Haddad, and LaJoie to insure that the recording is not missed.

As regards Claim 4, Haddad discloses that there are a plurality of content delivery paths (channels) each content delivery path having an associated availability status, and wherein (f) is repeated until it is determined that a respective content delivery path has an availability status of available or that all content delivery paths have an associated availability status of not available (cols. 10 and 11, and lines 66-67 and 1-13).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlarb (US 2004/0078823) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) and in further view of LaJoie (US 5,850,218) in further view of Yoshinobu (US 5,699,104).

As regards Claim 6, Schlarb, Haddad, and LaJoie jointly disclose the method of Claim 5, but they do not disclose displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program during receipt of the pay per view program. Yoshinobu discloses displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program during receipt of the pay per view program (cols. 10 and 11, lines 48-59 and 8-20).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the overlay system of Yoshinobu, an analogous art, to the PPV system of Schlarb, Haddad, and LaJoie to insure that no unauthorized viewing occurs.

Claims 11, 14-16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo (US 6,025,868) in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 6,157,377) and in further view of Haddad (US 6,072,982).

As regards Claim 11, Russo discloses a method of recording and accessing a pay per view program using a personal video recorder, the personal video recorder being accessible by the user (col. 3, lines 5-9), the method comprising: b) selecting one of the pay per view program to be transmitted to a personal video recorder (cols. 9 and 10, lines 61-67 and 1-11); c) receiving the pay per view program at the potential time, free of the user's request (col. 10, lines 13-19); d) recording the transmitted pay per view program (col. 10, lines 13-19); and e) after recording the transmitted pay per view program: displaying a user interface on a display device coupled to the personal video recorder, the user interface including a title of the recorded pay per view program (cols 10 and 11, lines 58-67 and 1-2); and allowing the user to access the recorded pay per view program (col. 11, lines 2-9). Russo fails to disclose a) receiving a schedule of pay-per-view programs, each of the pay-per-view programs having a title and a plurality of transmission times and selecting a potential transmission time from the plurality of transmission times corresponding to the selected pay-per-view program. Shah-Nazaroff (US 6,157,377) discloses a) receiving a schedule of pay-per-view programs (such as one presented in fig. 5, and col. 6, lines 15-16) at the personal video recorder (such as one housed in a set-top system, fig. 7. 720 and col. 7, lines 45-54), each of the pay-per-view programs having a title (such as "Lady and the Tramp") and a plurality of transmission times (3pm, 5pm, etc.) and selecting a potential transmission time from the

Art Unit: 2623

plurality of transmission times corresponding to the selected pay-per-view program (col. 6, lines 15-30).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the receiving and scheduling of pay-per-view programs, as done in Shah-Nazaroff, an analogous art, to the method and system of Russo, to offer the end user increasing ease and flexibility for viewing pay-per-view programs.

Russo and Shah-Nazaroff do not disclose the personal video recorder selecting one of the potential transmission times. Haddad discloses the personal video recorder selecting one of the potential transmission times (col. 14, lines 8-13).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the scheduling system of Haddad, an analogous art, to the PPV system of Schlarb to make it easier for the viewer to watch PPV events.

As regards Claim 14, Russo discloses that the pay per view program is recorded on a hard disk (col. 7, lines 43-52).

As regards Claim 15, Russo discloses that allowing the user to access the recorded pay per view program further comprises receiving payment authorization (col. 10, lines 20-38).

As regards Claim 16, Russo discloses that (a) comprises determining the pay per view program to be transmitted to the personal video recorder based on a user profile (also know as viewer preferences) (col. 10, lines 5-11).

As regards Claim 18, Russo discloses a personal video recorder for receiving a pay per view program (col. 3, lines 5-9), the personal video recorder comprising: at least

Art Unit: 2623

one content delivery path for receiving the pay per view program (fig. 1.2 and col. 3, lines 51-53); an external interface configured to facilitate communications between the personal video recorder and a provider of the pay per view program (fig. 1.12 and cols. 3 and 4, lines 62-67 and 1-2); and a controller (fig. 1.10 or, more specifically, 2.150 inside fig. 1.10) connected to the content delivery path and the external interface (col. 4, lines 3-5), the controller configured to receive the schedule for the pay per view program via the external interface (col. 4, lines 62-65), to select one of the plurality of transmission times corresponding to when the at least one content delivery path is available , and to receive the pay per view program on the at least one content delivery path by tuning to the channel associated with the selected transmission time (col. 9, lines 55-61). Russo fails to disclose the pay-per-view program having a schedule including a plurality of transmission times and channels associated with the plurality of transmission times. Shah-Nazaroff discloses Russo fails to disclose the pay-per-view program having a schedule including a plurality of transmission times and channels associated with the plurality of transmission times (fig. 5, and col. 6, lines 15-30).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the receiving and scheduling of pay-per-view programs, as done in Shah-Nazaroff, an analogous art, to the method and system of Russo, to offer the end user increasing ease and flexibility for viewing pay-per-view programs.

Russo and Shah-Nazaroff do not disclose a controller selecting one of the potential transmission times. Haddad discloses a controller selecting one of the potential transmission times (col. 14, lines 8-13).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the scheduling system of Haddad, an analogous art, to the PPV system of Schlarb to make it easier for the viewer to watch PPV events.

As regards Claim 19, Russo discloses a storage device connectable to the controller for storing the pay per view program (fig. 1.14 and col. 4, lines 15-18).

As regards Claim 20, Russo discloses that the storage device is a hard disk drive (col. 7, lines 43-52).

As regards Claim 21, Russo discloses a viewer control interface (such as remote control, fig. 2.163) connectable to the controller (via the infrared receiver, fig. 2.162), the viewer control interface configured to transmit signals to the controller indicating a viewer selection of the pay per view program (col. 9, lines 38-47).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo (US 6,025,868) in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 6,157,377) and in further view of Mendelsohn (US 6,771,886) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) and Ellis (US 2005/0235323).

As regards Claim 12, Russo, Shah-Nazaroff, and Haddad jointly disclose the method of Claim 11. Haddad further discloses modifying the potential transmission time by selecting another of the plurality of transmission times corresponding to the selected pay per view program (col. 8, lines 35-39, col. 10, lines 8-25, and col. 9 lines 25-31, showing that recording only proceeds if the recorder has sufficient resources). Russo, Shah-Nazaroff and Haddad fail to disclose 1) displaying a change channel request to

Art Unit: 2623

change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time at a predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time; 2) waiting a predetermined wait for response time for a response to the channel request from the user; 3) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is positive, proceeding to (c); 4) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is negative repeating (i)-(iv); and 5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, proceeding to (c). Ellis discloses (1) displaying a change channel request (presented as a viewer option in fig. 4b) to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time; (2) waiting a predetermined wait for response time for a response to the change channel request from the user; and (5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, determining that the availability status of the content path is available (recording process involves changing to the appropriate channel, fig. 3b between blocks 312 and 314, and figs. 3b and 4a and paragraph 52). If the receiver is not tuned to the correct channel (the channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast), then the recorder is unable to record the scheduled program and the availability status of the content delivery path (channel) is not available. Likewise, if the receiver is tuned to the appropriate channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast, then it is true that the status of the content delivery path is available.

Art Unit: 2623

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the reminder system of Ellis, an analogous art, to the PPV system of Russo, Shah-Nazaroff, and Haddad to insure that the no scheduled recording is intentionally missed.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo (US 6,025,868) in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 6,157,377) and in further view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) and in further view of Yoshinobu (US 5,699,104).

As regards Claim 13, Russo, Shah-Nazaroff, and Haddad disclose the method of Claim 11, but he fails to disclose wherein (b) further comprises displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program while transmitting the pay per view program to the personal video recorder. Yoshinobu discloses wherein (b) further comprises displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program while transmitting the pay per view program to the personal video recorder (cols. 10 and 11, lines 48-59 and 8-20).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the overlay system of Yoshinobu, an analogous art, to the PPV system of Russo, Shah-Nazaroff, and Haddad to insure that no unauthorized viewing occurs.

***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mendelsohn (US 6,771,886) discloses a recording device that allows a user to choose a program and then records it without the user specifying a time.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David R. O'Steen whose telephone number is 571-272-7931. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 5.




Art Unit: 2623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DRO



CHRISTOPHER GRANT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600